



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/521,933 | 12/06/2005 | Kenneth D. Pool | 10737-01004 | 2080 |
| 26116 7590 05/21/2008 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP 717 NORTH HARWOOD SUITE 3400 DALLAS, TX 75201 | | | | |
| EXAMINER WRIGHT, BRYAN F | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2131 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 05/21/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/521,933

Applicant(s)

POOL, KENNETH D.

Examiner

BRYAN WRIGHT

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/24/2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is response to the original filing of December 6, 2005. Claims (1-25) are pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 4-9, 13-15, and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Montague et al. (US Patent No. 5,675,782 and Montague hereinafter).
3. As to claim 1, Montague teaches a **method for regulating access to an object comprising the steps of:**

 for a plurality of users, allowing each user to designate (i.e., modify) the relationship characteristics (i.e., access permission) between that user and any other user [col. 6, lines 53-55];

 identifying (i.e., specifies) one (i.e., each) of the plurality of users (i.e., trustee) as an owner (i.e., access rights) of the object (i.e., entity) [col. 6, lines 31-35];

 determining if one of the plurality of users has access (i.e., user having appropriate permission) to the object by determining if the relationship characteristics on at least one path between the one of the plurality of users and

the owner of the object is a trusted relationship (i.e., database of trustees having access permission) **between each of the users on that path, where said path includes at least one other user** (i.e., additional trustee capture in database with access permission) **beside said owner** (i.e., user) **of the object** (i.e., entity) **and the one of the plurality of users** [col. 6, lines 40-46].

4. As to claim 4, Montague teaches **a method for regulating access to an object where the owner** (i.e., operating system/server) **of an object may designate another user** (i.e., trustee) **as acting on behalf of the owner** (i.e., operating system/server) [col. 6, lines 31-35].

5. As to claim 5, Montague teaches **a method for regulating access to an object where the relationship characteristics** (i.e., access permission) **include a trust relationship between the trusted user** (i.e., trustee) **and the designating user** (i.e., operating system/server) [col. 6, lines 31-35].

6. As to claim 6, Montague teaches **a method for regulating access to an object where the relationship characteristics** (i.e., access permissions) **include a trust relationship between the trusted user and the designating user** (i.e., operating system/server), **where the trust relationship limits** (i.e., access rights) **the tasks the trusted user** (i.e., trustee) **may perform** [col. 6, lines 31-35].

7. As to claim 7, Montague teaches **a method for regulating access to an object where the relationship characteristics** (i.e., access permissions) **include a trust relationship between the trusted user and the designating user, wherein the trust relationship limits the objects** (i.e., specific entity) **the trusted user may access** [col. 6, lines 41-46].

8. As to claim 8, Montague teaches **a method for regulating access to an object where the trust relationship** (i.e., access rights) **is limited to types of objects** (i.e., entity) [col. 6, lines 44-46].

9. As to claim 9, Montague teaches **a method for regulating access to an object where the trust relationship is limited to selected of objects** [col. 6, lines 44-46].

10. As to claim 13, Montague teaches **a method for regulating access to an object where the relationship characteristics** (i.e., access permission) **include a trust relationship between the trusted user and the designating user and wherein the trust relationship specifies a maximum number of relationships** (i.e., permission pair) **on a path** [par. 6, lines 56-60].

11. As to claim 14, Montague teaches **a method for regulating access** (i.e. permission) **to an object the maximum number of relationships** (i.e., permission pair) **is one** [par. 6, lines 56-60].

12. As to claim 15, Montague teaches a **method of regulating access to an object, the method comprising the steps of:**

identifying an object (i.e., specific entity) **or a set of objects to which access is to be regulated** (i.e., access rights) [col. 6, lines 43-46];

identifying (i.e., specify) **an owner** (i.e., trustee) **that has control of the object(s)** [col. 6, lines 31-35];

identifying (i.e., define) **an a relationship path** (i.e., permission) **which would otherwise be a valid path** [col. 6, lines 56-60];

allowing (i.e., define) **each relationship element to specify the maximum number of subsequent elements** (i.e., possible trustee) **in the path** [col. 6, lines 56-60];

and classifying (i.e., capability to modify) that relationship path (i.e., access rights) **as invalid if for any element in that path the number of subsequent elements** (i.e., list of trustees) **in the path** (i.e., access rights) **exceeds the limit** (i.e., list) **specified by that element** (i.e., user) (i.e., Montague teaches a user can only effect trustee access rights (e.g., **relationship path**) that is on the list. [col. 3, lines 10-20] Thus the list of trustee defines a pre-determined number of trustees (i.e., **subsequent elements**)).

13. As to claim 18, Montague teaches a **method for regulating access to an object where the owner** (i.e., operating system/server) **of an object may designate another user** (i.e., trustee) **as acting on behalf of the owner** (i.e., operating system/server) [col. 6, lines 31-35].

14. As to claim 19, Montague teaches a **method for regulating access to an object where the relationship path includes a plurality of relationship characteristics and at least one relationship characteristic includes a trust relationship between the trusted user (i.e., trustee) and the designating user (i.e., operating system/server), where the trust relationship limits the tasks (i.e., access permission) the trusted user may perform** [col. 6, lines 31-35].

15. As to claim 20, Montague teaches a **method for regulating access to an object where the relationship path includes a plurality of relationship characteristics and at least one relationship characteristic includes a trust relationship between the trusted user (i.e., trustee) and the designating user (i.e., operating system/server), where the trust relationship limits the objects the trusted user may access** [col. 6, lines 31-35].

16. As to claim 21, Montague teaches a **method for regulating access to an object where the trust relationship is limited to types of objects (i.e., specific entity)** [col. 6, lines 43-46].

17. As to claim 22, Montague teaches a **method for regulating access to an object where the trust relationship is limited to selected of objects** [col. 6, lines 43-46].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montague in view of Nagel et al (US Patent No. 7,181,017 and Nagel hereinafter).

18. As to claim 10-12, the system disclosed by Montague shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed in the paragraph above), it fails to disclose:

A method for regulating access to an object where the relationship characteristics include a distrusted relationship between the distrusted user and the designating user (claim 10).

A method for regulating access to an object where the distrusted relationship has an intermediary scope (claim 11).

A method for regulating access to an object where the distrusted relationship has a terminal scope (claim 12).

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Montague as introduced by Nagel. Nagel discloses:

A method for regulating access to an object where the relationship characteristics include a distrusted relationship between the distrusted user and the designating user (claim 10) (to provide a regulatory relational access to objects [fig. 3]).

A method for regulating access to an object where the distrusted relationship has an intermediary scope (claim 11) (to provide a intermediary relationship [320, 310, 330, 341, 342 fig. 3]).

A method for regulating access to an object where the distrusted relationship has an terminal scope (claim 12) (to provide a terminal relationship [320, 340, 330 fig. 3]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Nagel, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Montague by employing the well known features of intermediary and terminal relationships disclosed above by Nagel, for which object accessibility will be enhanced [fig. 3].

19. Claims 2, 3, 16, 17, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montague in view of Auer et al (US Patent No. 20030191946 and Auer hereinafter).

18. As to claim 2 and 3, the system disclosed by Montague shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed in the paragraph above), it fails to disclose:

A method for regulating access to an object where the relationship characteristics include one or more conditions such that the relationship characteristics are valid if and only if the one or more conditions are met
(claim 2).

A method for regulating access to an object where the relationship characteristics include one or more methods of determining a condition such that the relationship is valid if and only if the one or more methods of determining a condition confirm validity of the relationships characteristic
(claim 3).

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Montague as introduced by Auer. Auer discloses:

A method for regulating access to an object where the relationship characteristics include one or more conditions such that the relationship characteristics are valid if and only if the one or more conditions are met

(claim 2) (to provide entity relationship validation means base on pre-defined conditions [fig.7]).

A method for regulating access to an object where the relationship characteristics include one or more methods of determining a condition such that the relationship is valid if and only if the one or more methods of determining a condition confirm validity of the relationships characteristic (claim 3) (to provide entity relationship validation means base on pre-defined conditions [fig.7]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Auer, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Montague by employing the well known features of entity relationship validation disclosed above by Auer, for which relationships between entities will be enhanced [fig.7].

18. As to claim 16 and 17, the system disclosed by Montague shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed in the paragraph above), it fails to disclose:

A method for regulating access to an object where relationship path includes a plurality of relationship characteristics and at least one relationship characteristic includes one or more conditions such that the relationship characteristics are valid if and only if the one or more conditions are met (claim 16).

A method for regulating access to an object where the relationship path includes a plurality of relationship characteristics and at least one relationship characteristic includes one or more methods of determining a condition such that the relationship is valid if and only if the one or more methods of determining a condition confirm validity of the relationships characteristic (claim 17).

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Montague as introduced by Auer. Auer discloses:

A method for regulating access to an object where relationship path includes a plurality of relationship characteristics and at least one relationship characteristic includes one or more conditions such that the relationship characteristics are valid if and only if the one or more conditions are met (claim 16) (to provide entity relationship validation means base on pre-defined conditions [fig.7]).

A method for regulating access to an object where the relationship path includes a plurality of relationship characteristics and at least one relationship characteristic includes one or more methods of determining a condition such that the relationship is valid if and only if the one or more methods of determining a condition confirm validity of the relationships

characteristic (claim 17) (to provide entity relationship validation means base on pre-defined conditions [fig.7]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Auer, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Montague by employing the well known features of entity relationship validation disclosed above by Auer, for which relationships between entities will be enhanced [fig.7].

20. As to claim 24, Montague teaches a **method of regulating access to an object or set of objects, the method comprising the steps of:**

identifying an entity [col. 6, lines 43-46];

defining one or more classes (i.e., types of access control) **of control** (col. 6, lines 58-60);

Montague does expressly teach:

and specifying for the entity a set of zero or more conditions and/or a set of zero or more methods of determining a condition such that the entity is designated as a controlling entity of a specified class if and only if the said set of conditions is (are) met and/or the method(s) of determining a condition confirm(s) compliance.

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Montague as introduced by Auer. Auer discloses:

and specifying for the entity a set of zero or more conditions and/or a set of zero or more methods of determining a condition such that the entity is designated as a controlling entity of a specified class if and only if the said set of conditions is (are) met and/or the method(s) of determining a condition confirm(s) compliance (to provide entity relationship validation means base on pre-defined conditions [fig.7]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Auer, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Montague by employing the well known features of entity relationship validation disclosed above by Auer, for which relationships between entities will be enhanced [fig.7].

21. As to claim 25, Montague teaches a method of regulating access to an object, the method comprising the steps of:

identifying an object or a set of objects to which access is to be regulated [col. 6, lines 43-46];

identifying an entity that has control of the object(s) [col. 6, lines 31-35];

identifying an a relationship path which would otherwise be a valid path [col. 6, lines 56-60];

Montague does expressly teach:

**defining a distrust relationship as the designation of a distrustee as
distrusted by a distruster;**

**specifying for each distrust relationship a set of zero or more conditions
and/or a set of zero or more methods of determining a condition such that the
relationship is valid if and only if the said set of conditions is (are) met and/or the
method(s) of determining a condition confirm(s) validity;**

**and classifying that relationship path as invalid if for any element in that
path the grantee of that element is the distrustee of the distrust relationship.**

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Montague as introduced by Auer. Auer discloses:

**defining a distrust relationship as the designation of a distrustee as
distrusted by a distruster** (to provide entity relationship definition capability [fig.7]);

**specifying for each distrust relationship a set of zero or more conditions
and/or a set of zero or more methods of determining a condition such that the
relationship is valid if and only if the said set of conditions is (are) met and/or the
method(s) of determining a condition confirm(s) validity** (to provide entity
relationship validation means base on pre-defined conditions [fig.7]);

and classifying that relationship path as invalid if for any element in that path the grantee of that element is the distrustee of the distrust relationship (to provide entity relationship validation means base on pre-defined conditions [fig.7]).

Therefore, given the teachings of Auer, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Montague by employing the well known features of entity relationship validation disclosed above by Auer, for which relationships between entities will be enhanced [fig.7].

22. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montague in view of Sadjadi (US Patent No. 6,850,938).

23. As to claim 23, Montague teaches a **method of resolving a conflict regarding a specified access to an object, the method comprising the steps of:**

identifying a set of entities that have control of the object(s) [col. 6, lines 43-46];

defining an event of access conflict as the condition wherein one or more entity relationship(s) would grant the specified access to the object(s) and one or more entity relationship(s) would deny the specified access to the object(s) [col. 3, lines 17-27];

defining one or more classes of relationships (i.e., access types) between the object(s) and controlling entities [col. 6, lines 56-60];

Montague does expressly teach:

defining an equivalent class resolution rule for event(s) of access conflict wherein the controlling entity relationships for one or more relationship class to the object would grant the specified access and the controlling entity relationships for one or more relationship class with the same level in the class relationship hierarchy would deny the specified access to the object(s);

defining a within class resolution rule for event(s) of access conflict wherein the conflict arises among multiple entities which have the same class of relationship to the object(s);

and allowing or disallowing the specified access to the object(s) based on the entity relationship(s) based on the highest level class relationship to the object, the within class resolution rule, and the equivalent class resolution rule.

defining a hierarchy for the classes of object-entity relationships that is used to establish precedence in the event of an access conflict;

However, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Montague as introduced by Sadjadi. Sadjadi discloses:

defining an equivalent class resolution rule for event(s) of access conflict wherein the controlling entity relationships for one or more relationship class to

the object would grant the specified access and the controlling entity relationships for one or more relationship class with the same level in the class relationship hierarchy would deny the specified access to the object(s) (to provide access conflict resolution [fig. 1]);

defining a within class resolution rule for event(s) of access conflict wherein the conflict arises among multiple entities which have the same class of relationship to the object(s) (to provide access conflict resolution [fig. 1]);

and allowing or disallowing the specified access to the object(s) based on the entity relationship(s) based on the highest level class relationship to the object, the within class resolution rule, and the equivalent class resolution rule (to provide access conflict resolution [fig. 2a - fig. 2c]).

defining a hierarchy for the classes of object-entity relationships that is used to establish precedence in the event of an access conflict (to provide access conflict resolution [fig. 2a - fig. 2c]);

Therefore, given the teachings of Sadjadi, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the desirability and advantage of modifying Montague by employing the well known features of object access conflict resolution disclosed above by Sadjadi, for which object accessibility will be enhanced [fig. 1].

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRYAN WRIGHT whose telephone number is (571)270-3826. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5:30 pm Monday -Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, AYAZ Sheikh can be reached on (571)272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/BRYAN WRIGHT/

Examiner, Art Unit 2131

/Ayaz R. Sheikh/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2131